

## PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-M

### PC-M1

Lisa Peskay Malmsten  
Attorney at Law  
6215 E. Monita St.  
Long Beach CA 90803  
562-810-4789

August 12, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Comments on I-405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for the I-405 Improvement Project.

I live in University Park Estates and share the concerns expressed at the July 24, 2013 community meeting by other residents who also live adjacent to the extension of 22<sup>nd</sup> West, which we call 7<sup>th</sup> Street and which, frankly, has always been neglected by Cal Trans, as evidenced by its physical condition, the lack of thoughtful traffic-slowing strategies, the failure to integrate the state highway with the city streets it intersects, and overall unattractive appearance. I object to the City of Long Beach being required to pay its (mis)labeled "fair share" of a project that has essentially been forced upon it *until and unless these issues are addressed in a manner which provides a net benefit to Long Beach and does not merely mitigate conditions back to present levels.*

My reason for writing separately is my special interest in the coordination of highway planning with airport transportation planning. I have followed this subject sporadically for thirty years and attended a SCAG conference in the early '80s at which the percentage of growth at LAX (and resultant impact on regional freeway traffic) that was attributable to Orange County residents was discussed. I could find no information on this in the current DEIR/EIS which I believe is an important omission. (The only reference I found to any airport was the following statement:

On a regional level, I-405 provides access between cities in Orange and Los Angeles Counties. I-405 is used for commuting and inter-regional travel, along with direct and indirect access to employment centers, recreational attractions, shopping malls, medical centers, universities, airports, and other land uses.

This statement reflects virtually no research whatsoever! The failure to examine these trips results in the further failure to examine whether any portion of this traffic load could be managed by alternative forms of transportation, such as dedicated bus lanes or light-rail transit between major destinations.

### PC-M1 (Continued)

Parsons re: 405 / 2

Since the proposed project, even in the most expensive alternative and largest scale, would be inadequate when built (as stated repeatedly at the July 24 public meeting), the reasons for the trips and the application of one or more forms of mass transit as ways to prevent the project from being insufficient as soon as it is built, are essential pieces of information which must be addressed. The DEIR/EIS, as drafted, lacks any of this information.

2  
cont.

As a state agency, Caltrans is uniquely able to coordinate regional travel data, particularly needed if there is to be any reconciliation of different approaches to traffic between adjacent counties. Los Angeles County has devoted at least a portion of its transportation funding to the development of a light rail system, and yet will never be able to ameliorate (or even keep up with) the effects of regional traffic from counties which have chosen to embrace more and bigger freeways.

The Public Resources Code states in pertinent parts:

**21001.** The Legislature.....declares that it is the policy of the state to:  
(a) Develop and maintain a high-quality environment now and in the future, and take all action necessary to protect, rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state.

....  
(d) Ensure that the long-term protection of the environment, consistent with the provision of a decent home and suitable living environment for every Californian, shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions.

....  
(g) Require governmental agencies at all levels to consider qualitative factors as well as economic and technical factors and long-term benefits and costs, in addition to short-term benefits and costs and to consider alternatives to proposed actions affecting the environment.

**21002.** The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that **public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects**, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. ....[I]n the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project

PC-M1 (Continued)

Parsons re: 405 / 3

alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof. [Emphasis added.]

21002.1. In order to achieve the objectives set forth in Section 21002, the Legislature hereby finds and declares that the following policy shall apply to the use of environmental impact reports prepared pursuant to this division:

(a) The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.

Reference to these sections would seem to make it clear: when further revised to provide a more complete picture of regional traffic needs, including the origins and destinations of the trips this EIR/EIS will provide decision-makers with meaningful and necessary information on which to make both short and long-term decisions. Further, such information, and such consideration, is mandated by the Public Resources Code.

Thank you for your consideration and anticipated response to these comments.

Sincerely,

/s/

Lisa Peskay Malmsten  
Attorney at Law  
Board Member, University Park Estates Neighborhood Association  
[limalms@att.net](mailto:limalms@att.net)  
6215 E. Monita St.  
Long Beach CA 90803

joined by:

Pat Towner  
President  
University Park Estates Neighborhood Association  
[Pprmint10@aol.com](mailto:Pprmint10@aol.com)  
6239 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Long Beach, CA 90803  
562-430-7103

PC-M2

From: Luis and Jeannie Martinez [martinez9175@msn.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 6:13 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS; cbyrne@octa.net  
Subject: 405 Expansion project - Magnolia Off Ramp

We live in the tract where the braided off/on ramp would be located.

We strongly oppose this. It will affect our property values tremendously, not to mention make it even more noisier than it already is. The people's homes that back up to the freeway would lose value and privacy. How could this even be considered?







I don't even see why a braided on/off ramp is necessary.

Thank you,  
Jeannie & Luis Martinez  
9175 Poinsettia Ave.  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

3

1

PC-M3

	
<b>I-405 Improvement Project</b>	
<b>Comment Sheet</b>	
Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 17, 2012.	
Name (First and Last):	Michele McLeod
Organization:	
Address (Optional):	4264 Candliberry Ave, Seal Beach, CA 90740
Phone Number:	562-879-3949
Email address:	michele.mcleod@mindspring.com
Comments: Please Use ALT. 1 and Keep the original sound wall. Keep costs down. Please not toll road!	
Thank you.	
	
(Space for comments continued on reverse)	
	
	

PC-M4

August 9, 2013

CHRISTINA L. BYRNE  
Community Relations Officer  
Orange County Transportation Authority  
550 South Main Street  
Orange, California

Ms. Byrne:

Allow me to document my opposition to the proposed construction of a braided freeway ramp at northbound 405 exit at Magnolia and Warner Avenues.

Although I am not overly disturbed by the fact that vehicles could look directly onto my property (their eyes should be on the road and not on my backyard), we are concerned with other features of the proposed change.

Regardless of the fact that a sound barrier will be constructed, it is just that, a barrier against sound and, given our past experience for the last twenty years, they don't really do that much good. It is bound to be worse with increased traffic in the future, and in Los Angeles generally, and Orange County specifically. You can always count on the fact that there will be more traffic and more noise. Nothing can block it.

Additionally, our son has Asthma. The additional gas and oil fumes from exhaust emissions will be vented directly into our backyard, and may exacerbate his problems. There will be many such persons affected.

A huge concern of our family is safety. We wonder about the risk of a car driving out of control and veering off the on ramp and into the backyard. We play and swim in our backyard on a daily basis.

Further, homeowners being exposed to this flyover ramp are being subjected directly to a financial hit that will translate directly to their pocketbooks when they sell homes with no compensating dollars in return, which would have been the case with eminent domain. I honestly do not know what percentage of home value would be lost; however, even if it were only 10 %, some of these homes have been appraised at \$600,000.00 to \$800,000.00. Even a 10% value reduction would cost the owner sixty to eighty thousand dollars, and frankly, I feel the percentage would be higher. No one would want to buy a home looking at a flyover ramp unless they are bargain basement prices. This is not right and we would obviously like to avoid that possibility since the money we have invested in our home is our future.

Noise pollution, health concerns, safety, home values, these are our concerns and we hope a different solution can be found.

Kind regards,

James and Lynn Medeiros  
16975 Daisy Avenue  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

PC-M5

From: "Meyers, Stephani 074" <StephaniM@newportmeat.com>  
Subject: No to moving the soundwall

We live at 3580 Violet Street in College Park East. My cell number is 714-318-8581. My parents owned the home from 1979 until my father passed in January 2012. My husband and I are now renovating and moving back to the home I grew up in and are looking forward to doing so.

We would be adamantly opposed to moving the soundwall further in to College Park East in order to expand the 405 Freeway. Almond is used by many residents of the neighborhood to ride bikes, walk, run, etc. Many children walk Almond from bus stops and to go to and from the neighborhood parks and friends' homes. Traffic is fairly heavy on Almond and people tend to disobey the posted speed limits. I prefer to have more of a shoulder to avoid issues between pedestrians/bicyclists and these cars. I do consider it to be a safety issue in addition to a noise and quality of life issue for the neighborhood.

Please do NOT move the sound wall in to College Park East!

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephani Meyers  
Director of Credit and Accounting Controls  
Newport Meat Company  
16691 Hale Avenue, Irvine, CA 92606  
direct 949-399-4212  
fax 949-477-2322  
[stephanim@newportmeat.com](mailto:stephanim@newportmeat.com)

PC-M6

From: Roger Michaud [rjmichaud@aol.com]  
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 3:36 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Re:The Interstate 405 (I-405) Improvement Project

Due to repeated high congestion during AM and PM commuting on the 405 thru OC I would prefer to see the 2 lane expansion from Brookhurst/Euclid to 605 plan implemented.

Regards,

Roger Michaud

PC-M7

From: miller.sbccc@earthlink.net  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 10:01 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Comments Regarding the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for the I-405 Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Deshpande:

This email provides comments regarding the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for the I-405 Improvement Project.

While the intersections within the City of Long Beach were evaluated and mitigation measures proposed, no mitigation measures were proposed for the I-405 Freeway (Mainline) within the City of Long Beach. Mitigation measures for the I-405 Freeway (Mainline) within the City of Long Beach should be addressed because the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS indicates that portion of the freeway would be impacted by the Project.

A year ago, approximately \$800,000.00 was spent to improve the intersection of College Park Drive at the Studebaker Road off-ramp of the 22 Freeway. Should the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS proposed traffic signal for this intersection not be approved by Caltrans, College Park Drive should be extended to Studebaker Road and no longer intersect with the Studebaker Road off-ramp of the 22 Freeway.

Thank you for consideration of my additional comments.

Gary Miller

PC-M8

From: Gregg Millett [greggm92708@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 2:16 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Opposition to 405 Expansion Project Braided Off-Ramp Near Fountain Valley

Dear Christina Byrne, Community Outreach Director, OCTA,  
As a Fountain Valley resident of long-standing, I am opposed to the proposed North 405 fwy braided off-ramp located adjacent to the Westmont home development in Fountain Valley. Unlike off-ramps located near industrial and commercial areas, this braided off-ramp will negatively--and directly--impact Fountain Valley homeowners through reduced quality of life and diminished home values. Accordingly, I am formally requesting that you do not approve this proposal.

Respectfully,

Gregg Millett  
16809 Mulberry Circle  
Fountain Valley CA 92708  
(714) 378-9858

PC-M9

From: Teri [mailto:4terisa@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Saturday, June 29, 2013 12:23 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: 405 Project in OC

Hello,

I propose adding two GP lanes in each direction between the 605 and Bristol/Euclid street. I have been driving on this freeway for 30+ years during the heaviest of traffic. Based on my observations over the many years, I can attest that the majority of drivers are the sole occupant in the vehicle. These are the people, myself included, who are jamming up the freeways. Generally, the HOV lanes are clear so I do not see a benefit to the majority of commuters by adding additional HOV/toll lanes, nor do I believe that the number of sole drivers who are willing and or able to pay a toll fee will decrease traffic on the regular lanes. People will continue to drive alone; therefore, the addition of two GP lanes to the freeway will greatly help to ease congestion.

Regards,  
Teri Montgomery

PC-M10

From: Jeffrey Moore [mailto:jeffreysmoore@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 4:01 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

NO TOLL LANES, PLEASE!! The 110 toll lanes are a huge failure. They have made traffic worse! One GP lane and one additional carpool lane in each direction is the the best option. Thank you.  
Sent from my iPod

PC-M11

From: Thomas Moore [mailto:tjmoore99@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Saturday, July 27, 2013 10:43 AM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Regarding Proposed Improvements on westbound on/off ramp and College Park Drive

We just went to the meeting here in Seal Beach at Edison Park today. I saw the proposal to add a traffic light at the end of our street. (College Park Dr. / 7th Street Offramp) We, as a community, met previously and made several requests to not do a light as we think it would be worse than it is now.

As it is now, traffic flows smoothly during busy times and the lanes were redesigned to work well with our community. I believe a traffic light would cause serious backups on the offramp as that offramp is so heavily used and it flows nicely now. With any kind of traffic light, even one that lasts only 10-20 seconds for the stop light, it would cause disastrous slowdowns.

I think the money to change the lanes and add a traffic light would be a waste of money.

Also, in regards to adding a toll lane on the freeway, I strongly oppose that. I think adding ONE GP lane (each way) would be fine.

On another note, I think adding a commuter train in the middle of the freeway from Irvine Spectrum up to Long Beach Train station with several stops along the way would be a good idea since traffic in Los Angeles was built along the freeways, putting a train either on one side or in the middle of the freeway makes sense to me.

Thanks,

Thomas Moore  
192 College Park Dr.  
Seal Beach, CA

PC-M12

**From:** Brad & Trisha Morris [somethingobvious@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 17, 2013 12:04 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** 405 Improvement project

To whom it may concern:

I have spoken to Christina Byrne at OCTA and it seems that our sound wall is not in danger of moving at this time. Just to be certain that our concerns on this issue are heard, please see the note below listing environmental impacts for our home and neighborhood.

We still feel Alternative 1 is the best option for us, but I understand you have new council members who want to be thorough and explore other options as well.

Concerns/Comments re: the proposed expansion of the 405.

**Any scenario that involves tearing down and moving the soundwall in Seal Beach along Almond avenue is unacceptable**

- Any period of time without any part of the wall is unacceptable in our neighborhood. The noise would be completely intolerable not only from the construction, but from the freeway. Could you sleep with nothing between your home and the 405? How do you expect our children to?
- I am confident that the noise level while there is no wall violates any number of environmental issues in the study that were glossed only looking at the final result. The final result will certainly be bad enough for us, but the rebuild is completely intolerable.
- There is absolutely no way they can build a new wall before tearing down the old (not enough room for the workers and equipment between the two structures we are told).
- No one knows how long the wall be down because "they haven't looked at that closely yet". That answer is completely unacceptable given how long it could potentially be down.
- There will still be a backup as you approach the 605 because LA County is not do any expansion there. THAT BACK UP WILL FURTHER BOTTLENECK OUR EXITS AND CREATES FURTHER POLLUTION IN THE HOMES & COMMUNITIES BORDERING THE 405
- Our property values will likely decrease – almost certainly during the period where the wall is being rebuilt and it is non-existent, and even afterwards because we will lose the landscaping we currently enjoy, not all of the wall will be uniform as not all of it is moving, and because the noise and pollution will be that much closer to our homes. In addition, our exits will be bottlenecked by the narrowing of lanes at the county line so getting to and from our homes will be perceived as more challenging instead of an improvement.

PC-M12 (Continued)

- Pollution will only increase in an area that already has more than its fair share of black soot on everything.
- We will lose 1 side of parking on Almond. This may not seem like a big deal at first blush, but our street sweeping does one side of a cul de sac at a time, and several of our cul de sacs have limited to almost no curb parking. What happens when the street sweeper is coming down the side of Almond that has parking – where are those cars supposed to go? Blocks away?
- We have enjoyed that wider street now for several decades and a more narrow street will affect the safety of our children, bicyclists, roller bladers, runners, walkers, dog walkers, and the elderly who prefer to use their walkers on the road instead of the bumpy sidewalk. And that list is not all inclusive as many of our residents use Almond to access our parks.
- Measure M did not approve Alternative 2 and 3, only Alternative 1.
- The new wall will not be as good as our current one – not up to the same earthquake standards as when originally built.
- I lack faith that the builders will truly make rebuilding the wall a priority – what if something happens and we don't get our wall back for a long time or at all!
- Power outages for the entire neighborhood as power lines are relocated is unacceptable
- We are equally concerned for our neighbors in Fountain Valley who will lose jobs and revenue for the city when 4 of their businesses are uprooted. I know there is talk about relocating them, but so much of a business's success is dependent on it's location – it is unlikely to be a move up for them.
- We will lose trees in Almond Park if the wall is moved at all in that area. The plan right now is to not move that part, so why do you have to move the adjacent parts????
- It seems that either Alternative 2 or 3 will create more lanes of traffic outside our neighborhood by just moving the bottleneck to the LA Count/Orange County interface on the 405. The result is we'll have MORE pollution and noise in our neighborhood as the freeway clogs right at the border, and all those extra cars have nowhere to go with no other freeways expanded. The 605 northbound has never been an issue; the majority of the traffic backup is caused by the 405 north of OC, and expanding the freeway to the border not only fails to address the issue it makes the pollution worse in this area as more cars are backed up more hours of the day on the freeway. The added pollution could be significant for all of us, especially children with asthma, and elderly people with emphysema/COPD, bronchitis, or asthma.

Proposals:

- Go with Alternative 1 as approved by the voters in Measure M
- Narrow the shoulder by a few feet where necessary to avoid moving the wall at all – bridges don't have to have a 10' foot shoulder, so having small sections with smaller shoulders should be achievable without having to make changes to the soundwall.
- Start eliminating one of the General Purpose lanes early to avoid moving the wall

1  
cont.

**PC-M12 (Continued)**

- Consider light rail or some other public transportation.
- Lobby the heck out of the Navy to give a few feet where needed on their side – we don't need 10 feet all the way, just occasionally
- **DO WHATEVER IT TAKES NOT TO MOVE THE WALL!!!!!!!!!!!!**

1  
cont.

**PC-M13**

**From:** enettem7@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 01, 2013 3:31 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** Toll lanes

I am absolutely opposed to caltrans putting in toll lanes on freeways. The public has already paid for roads in taxes. Furthermore, toll roads impact lower socioeconomic people more than the wealthy. NO TOLL ROADS!  
Enette Murachver, a voting senior.

1

Sent from Samsung tablet

## **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-M**

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M1**

#### **Comment PC-M1-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

A fair share of the costs for the improvements proposed in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS under Measure T-10 would address cumulative significant impacts to traffic on SR-22 (7<sup>th</sup> Street), which is a State highway. This fair share would be contributed by the I-405 Improvement Project for the proposed improvements. The remainder of the funding would be the responsibility of the State, not the City of Long Beach.

#### **Comment PC-M1-2**

Please see Common Response – Elimination of Light-Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives.

#### **Comment PC-M1-3**

The Draft EIR/EIS and the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS identify the adverse effects and significant impacts of the proposed project on the environment, based on an examination of a range of topics covered in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Chapter 3 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. Section 2.2.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS makes it clear that a range of alternatives were considered during the project development process.

Section 1.2.2.1, Capacity, Transportation Demand, and Safety, of the Draft EIR/EIS makes it clear, under the subheading “Regional Population and Employment Growth Trends,” that I-405 serves population and employment centers along the project corridor. Additionally, Section 1.2.2.5, Modal Inter-Relationships and System Linkages, of the Draft EIR/EIS makes it clear that I-405 provides intra-regional, inter-regional, and local access for both Orange and Los Angeles counties. Under the heading “Traffic Forecasting Model” on page 3.1.6-38 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the traffic forecasts are explained. The Traffic Study (Draft EIR/EIS Technical Appendix L), in Section 2.2.2, Future Years Traffic Volumes (2020 and 2040), contains a more thorough explanation of the forecasting process. That explanation identifies the forecasting model as a regional model and a traditional four-step forecasting process. The third of those four steps is



explained as distributing trips from each origin zone in the regional model to each destination zone. This step of the modeling process provides a complete consideration of the origins and destinations of regional traffic. Taken together, these sections provide decision makers with information regarding the origins and destinations of traffic using the corridor.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M2**

#### **Comment PC-M2-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Property Values, Noise/Noise Analysis.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M3**

#### **Comment PC-M3-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Almond Avenue Soundwall, Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M4**

#### **Comment PC-M4-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Noise/Noise Analysis, Health Risks, Property Values.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M5**

#### **Comment PC-M5-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall, Preferred Alternative Identification.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M6**

#### **Comment PC-M6-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M7**

#### **Comment PC-M7-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Tables 3-2 and 3-6 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS show that LOS anticipated in 2020 and 2040 on I-405 north of I-605 to Lakewood Boulevard does not change when comparing alternatives, including the No Build Alternative.

Table 3-6 shows 2040 D/C ratios of 1.00 or more along the I-405 mainline from I-605 to Studebaker Road for all alternatives, including the No Build Alternative. On I-405, between Studebaker Road and Lakewood Boulevard, D/C ratios of 0.97 or more are anticipated. All of these values are indicative of heavy congestion with stop-and-go conditions. While the D/C ratios increase under the build alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative, the fact that heavy congestion is anticipated under the no-build condition indicates that the proposed project would have an impact, but the impact would not be significant. The fact that LOS does not change when comparing the alternatives also indicates impacts would not be significant.

Table 3-2 shows D/C ratios of 0.92 or more along the I-405 mainline from I-605 to Studebaker Road for all alternatives, including the No Build Alternative. On I-405, between Studebaker Road and Lakewood Boulevard, D/C ratios of 0.92 or more are anticipated. All of these values are indicative of congestion with some stop-and-go conditions. While the D/C ratios increase under the build alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative, these increases are not sufficient to change LOS. The fact that LOS does not change when comparing the alternatives indicates impacts would not be significant.

**Comment PC-M7-2**

Because Measure T-11 provides that the I-405 Improvement Project would make a fair share contribution for the improvements included in the measure, that fair share amount would be unaffected and could be used by Caltrans to implement either the improvement included in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, the improvement suggested in the comment, or any other improvement that addresses the cumulative adverse effect at the intersection.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-M8****Comment PC-M8-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Property Values.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-M9****Comment PC-M9-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M10**

#### **Comment PC-M10-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification, Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-M11**

#### **Comment PC-M11-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Analysis of the proposed improvements at the intersection of College Park Drive and the SR-22 westbound ramps is presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. The analysis shows that the queues would not back up onto the SR-22 westbound freeway. The following table presents the anticipated queues; the data are presented in the Supplemental Traffic Study Report – Long Beach Area in Appendices III A-1, III A-2, IV A-1, and IV A-2 for Alternative 1 year 2020, Alternative 1 year 2040, Alternative 2 year 2020, and Alternative 2 year 2040, respectively. The table shows that the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues anticipated approaching the intersection with the proposed signal would not exceed 240 feet during the peak hours in the years 2020 and 2040. The distance from the stop line for the proposed signal at the intersection of the ramp with College Park Drive to the gore point is approximately 850 feet.

<b>Anticipated 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile Queues on the SR-22 Westbound Exit Ramp Approach to the Proposed Signal at College Park Drive</b>			
		<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>
2020	AM	142	148
	PM	223	240
2040	AM	160	189
	PM	226	240

The analysis presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3-9 and 3-11 shows that the proposed signal will operate at LOS B or C in the peak hours in 2020 and 2040.

**Comment PC-M11-2**

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

**Comment PC-M11-3**

Please see Common Response – Elimination of Light-Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-M12**

**Comment PC-M12-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS) for Responses to Comments PC-A17-1 through PC-A17-12.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-M13**

**Comment PC-M13-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification, Opposition to Tolling.

This page intentionally left blank.